



**MSP NOISE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**  
Wednesday, February 17, 2021 at 1:30 PM  
\*\*By Teleconference Only\*\*



### **Call to Order**

A special meeting of the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) Noise Oversight Committee, (NOC) having been duly called, was held Wednesday, February 17, 2021, by teleconference only. This meeting was called by Co-chairs, Jeff Hart and Dianne Miller to address a Federal Register Notice published by the FAA on January 13 with comments requested by the FAA by March 15. Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The following were on the teleconference:

**Representatives:** R. Barrette, P. Borgstrom, P. Dymtrenko, C. Finlayson, J. Hart, C. Jacobson, P. Martin, D. Miller, A. Moos, L. Olson, C. Potter

**Staff:** C. Boyd, R. Fuhrmann, B. Juffer, J. Lewis, K. Martin, N. Pesky, M. Ross, M. Takamiya, Y. Bizen, R. Ginsburg, J. Welbes

**Others:** H. Rand – Inver Grove Heights, L. Moore – Bloomington, K. Mara – FAA, S. Doyle – FAA, D. Drozdal – FAA, J. Ipsen – FAA, D. Scata – FAA, S. Fortier – FAA, and other members of the public

**A quorum** of five Community Representatives, and six Industry Representatives was established by roll call attendance:

**Community Representatives:** P. Dymtrenko, C. Jacobson, P. Martin, D. Miller, L. Olson

**Industry Representatives:** R. Barrette, P. Borgstrom, C. Finlayson, J. Hart, A. Moos, C. Potter

## **1. Consent**

### **1.1. Review and Approval of January 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

There were no questions or revisions to the January 20th meeting minutes.

**Chair Miller** asked if anyone would like to move to approve the Consent agenda. **Co-chair Hart moved**, and **Member Olson seconded** approval of the Consent item listed above. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

**Ayes:** Eleven  
Barrette, Borgstrom, Dymtrenko, Finlayson, Jacobson, Martin, Hart, Miller, Moos, Olson, Potter

**Nays:** None

**Abstain:** None

## **2. Public Comment Period**

There were no questions or comments from the public.

### 3. Business

#### 3.1 FAA Neighborhood Environmental Survey

**Brad Juffer**, Technical Advisor, provided a summary of the release, and suggested action for the Committee. At the January NOC meeting, FAA representatives spoke with the Committee about their release to the Federal Register regarding the Overview of FAA Aircraft Noise Policy and Research Efforts. At the NOC January meeting, the survey results were newly released, so there was limited time for review by staff or Committee members. This special meeting of the NOC allows more time for review. Members of the FAA were available to answer questions.

The Federal Register Notice includes a wide range of activity being undertaken by the FAA in the area of Noise Policy and Research Efforts. According to the Notice, these activities are categorized into 3 distinct areas. First is research on the effects of Aircraft Noise on Individuals and Communities. The research includes:

- Speech Interference and Children’s Learning
- Neighborhood Environmental Survey
- Health and Human Impacts
- Impacts to Cardiovascular
- Sleep Disturbance
- Economic Impacts

The second area is a host of tools the FAA uses to quantify noise exposure throughout the NAS. Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) is one that the Committee is familiar with as staff uses this frequently in analysis for the NOC. Noise screening is a derivative of AEDT that the FAA uses to quickly complete reviews of proposed Federal Action when significant noise impacts are not expected. The notice discusses an Environmental Data Visualization Tool the FAA has developed to visually display noise data to the public and finally in this category the Notice discusses the use of supplemental noise metrics that can be used in addition to DNL during National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes.

The final area is research being undertaken to explore reduction, abatement, and mitigation of aviation noise. On the topic of aircraft source noise reduction, the notice describes the Continuous Lower Energy, Emissions, and Noise (CLEEN) program. This research partners with manufacturing industry to share the cost of research and development of lower noise and emissions technology. According to the notice, Noise Abatement work includes an exploration of how PBN can better control flight paths and move them away from noise-sensitive areas, how changes in aircraft performance could be safely managed to reduce noise, and how systematic departure flight track dispersion can be implemented to abate noise concerns. Last in this area is a discussion on noise mitigation research. The notice says the FAA is exploring the cost-benefit calculus of existing noise mitigation strategies and technologies in order to better direct where and how limited mitigation resources should be applied.

The Notice discusses that community response to noise has historically been a primary factor underlying the FAA's noise-related policies, including the establishment of DNL 65 dB as the threshold of “significant” aircraft noise exposure. The notice states that the FAA will not make any determinations on implications from these emerging research results for FAA noise policies until it

has carefully considered public and other stakeholder input and assesses the factors behind any increases in community impacts from aircraft noise exposure.

**Juffer** discussed that current FAA noise policy is informed by a dose-response curve initially created in the 1970s known as the *Schultz Curve*. This dose-response curve is generally accepted as a representation of noise impacts and has been revalidated by subsequent analyses over the years. In 1992, the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) reviewed the use of the *Schultz Curve*, and created an updated version of the curve using additional social survey data. Due to the age of the original survey data the Neighborhood Environmental Survey (NES) was conducted to create a new nationally representative dose-response curve to understand how community response to aircraft noise may have changed.

**Juffer** discussed the survey methodology used by the FAA. 20 airports were selected to survey neighbors that collectively would represent all airports. As a minimum, the airports selected had to have at least 100 jet operations per day and have at least 100 homes in the 60-65 dB DNL contour and >65 dB DNL contour. For the NES, the FAA required ATL, ORD, LAX and at least one NYC airport be included. The remaining sixteen airports were chosen at random to ensure balanced sampling could be achieved. MSP was not included in the survey but was eligible. Residents were surveyed around two other airports in our region at ORD and DTW. The residents were surveyed with a mailed survey that consisted of only one question. That question asked respondents to rate their level of annoyance to twelve distinct items. The survey was mailed to over 25,000 people and was completed by more than 10,000 people.

**Juffer** explained the survey results. The survey responses were grouped according to the respondent's noise exposure level in five dB DNL categories. These collective grouped responses were used to build dose-response curves. All responses were aggregated together to then develop a national dose-response curve. The level of annoyance recorded in the NES is substantially higher than the original Schultz Curve. The annoyance at DNL 65 increased from 12.3% in the 1992 report to 60 – 71% in the NES.

**Juffer** laid out next steps for the members. The FAA has requested feedback on other factors that may have caused the increase, additional investigation within their three focus areas, or other additional investigation that would inform noise policy. To fulfill this request the NOC drafted a letter for review. In summary, the letter asks the FAA to continue to explore and accelerate research on source noise reduction technology and incentivize operators to employ it. The letter discusses the introduction of NextGen flight procedure changes nationally and locally as an important factor influencing the annoyance levels recorded in the survey. The letter encourages the FAA to involve the community early when considering flight procedure changes. The letter asks the FAA to consider noise beyond 65 dB DNL when making policy decisions and think creatively to reduce noise impacts outside of the traditional 65 dB DNL level. The letter asks the FAA to study the inclusion of alternative noise metrics when quantifying noise exposure. Finally, the letter encourages the timely conclusion of current noise exposure research being undertaken to complete the portfolio of understanding on the topic. It also states clearly that the NOC is eager to participate in future policy discussions when that research has been completed and the information is available.

**Juffer** offered to answer questions from the Committee and reminded everyone that there were FAA members available to answer questions as well.

**Chair Miller**, hearing no questions, asked if anyone would like to move to the requested action.

**Requested Action:** Approve the letter and request that the MAC Planning, Development and Environment Committee endorse and file it on Federal Docket No. FAA-2021-0037 "Overview of FAA Aircraft Noise Policy and Research Efforts".

There was a motion by **Member Martin**, with a second by **Member Dymtrenko**. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

**Ayes:** Eleven  
Barrette, Borgstrom, Dymtrenko, Finlayson, Hart, Jacobson, Martin, D. Miller, Moos, Olson, Potter  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** None

#### 4. Information

There were no information items.

#### 5. Announcements

**March NOC Meeting**

Wednesday, March 17, 2021 @ 1:30pm  
Virtual Teleconference

**Spring Listening Session**

Wednesday, April 28, 2021 @ 6pm  
Virtual Teleconference

#### 6. Adjourn

**Chair Miller** thanked the members of the Committee, NOC staff and residents in attendance. The meeting was adjourned at 1:56 pm.